



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/823,152	04/12/2004	Philip A. Carpino	PC25808A	4558

28523 7590 08/01/2007  
PFIZER INC.  
PATENT DEPARTMENT, MS8260-1611  
EASTERN POINT ROAD  
GROTON, CT 06340

EXAMINER
----------

DESAI, RITA J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1625

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/01/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<p align="center"><b>Office Action Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Application No.</b></p> <p align="center">10/823,152</p>	<p><b>Applicant(s)</b></p> <p align="center">CARPINO ET AL.</p>	
	<p><b>Examiner</b></p> <p align="center">Rita J. Desai</p>	<p><b>Art Unit</b></p> <p align="center">1625</p>	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 November 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7-11, 30, 31, 34-36, 42, 43, 49, 55, 59 and 64 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7-11, 30, 31, 34-36, 42, 43, 49, 55, 59 and 64 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/05</u> .   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

Art Unit: 1625

### DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-4, 7-11, 30, 31, 34-36, 42, 43, 49, 55, 59 and 64 are pending.

The IDS submitted on 10/28/05 has been considered.

Claims 1-4, 7-11, 30,31, 34,36, 42,43, 49,55 are drawn to compounds and pharmaceutical compositions.

Claims 59 and 64 are drawn to method of treating .

The examiner had restricted the compounds and the method of treating, but had later rejoined them in paper mailed 9/2005.

The rejection made over Aebi et al under 35 USC 103 has been maintained.

The claimed compounds with the ethyl at the 1 position ( when R1a is a H) is structurally homologous and obvious in view of the compounds of Aebi et al . Office action 9/14/06 pp2-3 particularly paragraph 4), which has a methyl at the corresponding position ( R4 of the compounds of Aebi et al ). See table 4.

Applicants argue 1) the methyl group at R4 of the Aebi et al compound is critical because it is present in all groups at R4 of the Aebi et al compound is critical because it is present in all synthesized compounds of table 4 and thus one would not modify the methyl to an ethyl and 2) there is no teaching or suggestion to modify the compound of Aebi et al to design a compound that can be used that can be used as a cannabinoid -1 (CB-1) antagonist for the treatment of diseases mediated by CB-1.

The previous examiner withdrew the rejection.

However this examiner is maintaining it.

It is likely that Aebi et al maintained the methyl at the R4 position as it was not critical to the compounds biological activity focusing on the more critical variations. Even then with compounds with such close structural similarities, modifying a methyl to an ethyl group is within the scope of routine experimentation. Applicants claims are drawn to the compounds and not just the method of treating.

In re Hiniker Co (CA FC) 47 USPQ2d 1523 at 1529.

Art Unit: 1625

The Aebi et al compounds have not been compared with the applicants claimed compounds to show unexpected superior properties. Absent such a showing, the applicants have not met the burden of showing that the difference in the results is in fact unexpected and unobvious and of both statistical and practical significance. According to MPEO 716.02(b).

Hence the previous rejection has been maintained.

New grounds of Rejections:-

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 42 has no definition of R1c.

Correction is required..

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-4, 7-11, 30, 31, 34-36, 42, 43, 49, 55, 59 and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for making salts of the claimed

Art Unit: 1625

compounds, does not reasonably provide enablement for making solvates and hydrates of the claimed compounds. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art of synthetic organic chemistry to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. "The factors to be considered [in making an enablement rejection] have been summarized as a) the quantity of experimentation necessary, b) the amount of direction or guidance presented, c) the presence or absence of working examples, d) the nature of the invention, e) the state of the prior art, f) the relative skill of those in that art, g) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, h) and the breadth of the claims", *In re Rainer*, 146 USPQ 218 (1965); *In re Colianni*, 195 USPQ 150, *Ex parte Formal*, 230 USPQ 546. In the present case the important factors leading to a conclusion of undue experimentation are the absence of any working example of a formed solvate, the lack of predictability in the art, and the broad scope of the claims.

g) The state of the art is that is not predictable whether solvates will form or what their composition will be. In the language of the physical chemist, a solvate of organic molecule is an interstitial solid solution. This phrase is defined in the second paragraph on page 358 of West (Solid State Chemistry). West, Anthony R., "Solid State Chemistry and its Applications, Wiley, New York, 1988, pages 358 & 365. The solvent molecule is a species introduced into the crystal and no part of the organic host molecule is left out or replaced. In the first paragraph on page 365, West (Solid State Chemistry) says, "it is not usually possible to predict whether solid solutions will form, or if they do form what is their compositional extent". Thus, in the absence of experimentation one cannot predict if a particular solvent will solvate any particular crystal. One cannot predict the stoichiometry of the formed solvate, i.e. if one, two, or a half a molecule of solvent added per molecule of host. In the same paragraph on page 365 West (Solid State

Art Unit: 1625

Chemistry) explains that it is possible to make meta-stable non-equilibrium solvates, further clouding what Applicants mean by the word solvate. Compared with polymorphs, there is an additional degree of freedom to solvates, which means a different solvent or even the moisture of the air that might change the stable region of the solvate.

h) The breadth of the claims includes all of the hundreds of thousands of compounds of formula I and II as well as the presently unknown list of solvents embraced by the term "solvate". Thus, the scope is broad.

Claims 1-4, 7-11, 30, 31, 34-36, 42, 43, 49, 55, 59 and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for making salts of the claimed compounds, does not reasonably provide enablement for making solvates and hydrates of the claimed compounds. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art of synthetic organic chemistry to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. "The factors to be considered [in making an enablement rejection] have been summarized as the quantity of experimentation necessary, the amount of direction or guidance presented, the presence or absence of working examples, the nature of the invention, the state of the prior art, the relative skill of those in that art, the predictability or unpredictability of the art and the breadth of the claims", *In re Rainer*, 146 USPQ 218 (1965); *In re Colianni*, 195 USPQ 150, *Ex parte Formal*, 230 USPQ 546. a) Determining if any particular substrate would form a solvate or hydrate would require synthesis of the substrate and subjecting it to recrystallization with a variety of solvents, temperatures, pressures, and humidity. The experimentation is potentially open-ended. b) The direction concerning the hydrates is found on pages 4, 6, 7 which simply states Applicants intent to make them. c) There is no working example of any hydrate or solvate formed. The

Art Unit: 1625

claims are drawn to solvates, yet the numerous examples presented all failed to produce a solvate. These cannot be simply willed into existence. As was stated in *Morton International Inc. v. Cardinal Chemical Co.*, 28 USPQ2d 1190 "The specification purports to teach, with over fifty examples, the preparation of the claimed compounds with the required connectivity. However ... there is no evidence that such compounds exist... the examples of the '881 patent do not produce the postulated compounds... there is ... no evidence that such compounds even exist." The same circumstance appears to be true here. There is no evidence that solvates of these compounds actually exist; if they did, they would have formed. Hence, applicants must show that solvates can be made, or limit the claims accordingly.

d) The nature of the invention is chemical synthesis, which involves chemical reactions.

e) The state of the art is that is not predictable whether solvates will form or what their composition will be. In the language of the physical chemist, a solvate of organic molecule is an interstitial solid solution. This phrase is defined in the second paragraph on page 358 of West (Solid State Chemistry). West, Anthony R., "Solid State Chemistry and its Applications, Wiley, New York, 1988, pages 358 & 365. The solvent molecule is a species introduced into the crystal and no part of the organic host molecule is left out or replaced. In the first paragraph on page 365, West (Solid State Chemistry) says, "it is not usually possible to predict whether solid solutions will form, or if they do form what is their compositional extent". Thus, in the absence of experimentation one cannot predict if a particular solvent will solvate any particular crystal. One cannot predict the stoichiometry of the formed solvate, i.e. if one, two, or a half a molecule of solvent added per molecule of host. In the same paragraph on page 365 West (Solid State Chemistry) explains that it is possible to make meta-stable non-equilibrium solvates, further

Art Unit: 1625

clouding what Applicants mean by the word solvate. Compared with polymorphs, there is an additional degree of freedom to solvates, which means a different solvent or even the moisture of the air that might change the stabile region of the solvate. f) The artisan using Applicants invention to prepare the claimed compounds would be a process chemist or pilot plant operator with a BS degree in chemistry and several years of experience. g) Chemical reactions are well-known to be unpredictable, *In re Marzocchi*, 169 USPQ 367, *In re Fisher*, 166 USPQ 18. h) The breadth of the claims includes all of the thousands of compounds of formula I and II as well as the presently unknown list of solvents embraced by the term "solvate" or "hydrate"

MPEP 2164.01(a) states, "A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. *In re Wright*, 999 F.2d 1557,1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)." That conclusion is clearly justified here. Thus, undue experimentation will be required to practice Applicants' invention.

Claims 1-4, 7-11, 30, 31, 34-36, 42, 43, 49, 55, 59 and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for compounds wherein R1 and Ro are aryl (phenyl) with halogen or methoxy substituents, or R4 to be an alkyl, halogen substituted alkyl or a cycloalkyl,

does not reasonably provide enablement for R1, Ro or R4 to be a hetero aryl or have other substituents or any chemical moiety selected from alkyl, 3 to 8 membered partially or fully saturated carbocyclic ring or 3-6 membered partially or fully saturated heterocycle, aryl,



Art Unit: 1625

heteroaryl, wherein the chemical moiety is again optionally substituted. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

In re Wands, 858 F.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

There are many factors to be considered when determining whether there is sufficient evidence to support a determination that a disclosure does not satisfy the enablement requirement and whether any necessary experimentation is "undue". These factors include 1) the breadth of the claims, 2) the nature of the invention, 3) the state of the prior art, 4) the level of one of ordinary skill, 5) the level of predictability in the art, 6) the amount of direction provided by the inventor, 7) the existence of working examples, and 8) the quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure. In re Wands, 858 F.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

**1) The breadth of the claims:** The instant claims encompass many thousands of compounds from an aromatic carbocyclic moiety to an aromatic carbocyclic moiety having many large electron withdrawing and bulky groups substituted on it to a moiety having many heterocyclic rings. These compounds cover a very wide range of compounds.

**2) The nature of the invention:** The invention is drawn to compound used to treat diseases

**3) The state of the prior art:**

How to Use:-

The state of the prior art is that the drugs and the enzymes react in a lock and key mechanism and the structure of the compound has to be specific. Even a difference of a methyl group versus a hydrogen changes the properties altogether. A good example is a theophylline versus caffeine. They differ by just a methyl group but one of them has a pharmaceutical use as a bronchodilator. There is no absolute predictability and no established correlation between the different substitutions on a core that they would all behave in the exact same way.

Also again the state of the prior art is that it involves screening in vitro and in vivo to determine which compounds exhibit the desired pharmacological activities. There is no absolute predictability and no established correlation between in vitro activity and the treatment diseases is not a reliable predictor of success even in view of the seemingly high level of skill in the art.

The existence of these obstacles establishes that the contemporary knowledge in the art would prevent one of ordinary skill in the art from accepting any therapeutic regimen on its face.

How to make :-

Art Unit: 1625

Any chemist would know that it is not a quick and easy way of synthesizing compounds.

As stated in the preface to a recent treatise:

"Most non-chemists would probably be horrified if they were to learn how many attempted syntheses fail, and how inefficient research chemists are. The ratio of successful to unsuccessful chemical experiments in a normal research laboratory is far below unity, and synthetic research chemists, in the same way as most scientists, spend most of their time working out what went wrong, and why. Despite the many pitfalls lurking in organic synthesis, most organic chemistry textbooks and research articles do give the impression that organic reactions just proceed smoothly and that the total synthesis of complex natural products, for instance, is maybe a labor-intensive but otherwise undemanding task. In fact, most syntheses of structurally complex natural products are the result of several years of hard work by a team of chemists, with almost every step requiring careful optimization. The final synthesis usually looks quite different from that originally planned, because of unexpected difficulties encountered in the initially chosen synthetic sequence. Only the seasoned practitioner who has experienced for himself the many failures and frustrations which the development (sometimes even the repetition) of a synthesis usually implies will be able to appraise such work .....Chemists tend not to publish negative results, because these are, as opposed to positive results, never definite (and far too copious) ....." Dorwald F. A.

Side Reactions in Organic Synthesis, 2005, Wiley: VCH, Weinheim pg. IX of Preface

The availability of the starting material that is needed to prepare the invention as claimed is at issue here.. As per MPEP 2164.01 (b):

A key issue that can arise when determining whether the specification is enabling is whether the starting materials or apparatus necessary to make the invention are available. In the biotechnical area, this is often true when the product or process requires a particular strain of microorganism and when the microorganism is available only after extensive screening. The Court in *In re Ghiron*, 442 F.2d 985, 991, 169 USPQ 723, 727 (CCPA 1971), made clear that if the practice of a method requires a particular apparatus, the application must provide a sufficient disclosure of the apparatus if the apparatus is not readily available. The same can be said if certain chemicals are required to make a compound or practice a chemical process. In *re Howarth*, 654 F.2d 103, 105, 210 USPQ 689, 691 (CCPA 1981).

**4) The level of one of ordinary skill:** The ordinary artisan is highly skilled.

**5) The level of predictability in the art:** It is noted that the pharmaceutical art is unpredictable, requiring each embodiment to be individually assessed for physiological activity. In *re Fisher*, 427 F. 2d 833, 166 USPQ 18 (CCPA 1970) indicates that the more unpredictable an area is, the more specific enablement is necessary in order to satisfy the statute. The level of unpredictability in the art is very high. The compounds which differ by a methyl group also

Art Unit: 1625

show different properties, for e.g. theophylline and caffeine. One of them is a bronchodilator and they differ only by a methyl group.

See *In re Fisher*, 166 USPQ 18, at 24 (In cases involving unpredictable factors, such as most chemical reactions and physiological activity, the scope of enablement obviously varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved.), *Nationwide Chemical Corporation, et al. v. Wright, et al.*, 192 USPQ 95 (one skilled in chemical and biological arts cannot always reasonably predict how different chemical compounds and elements might behave under varying circumstances), *Ex parte Sudilovsky* 21 USPQ2d 1702 (Appellant's invention concerns pharmaceutical activity. Because there is no evidence of record of analogous activity for similar compounds, the art is relatively unpredictable) *In re Wright* 27 USPQ2d 1510 (the physiological activity of RNA viruses was sufficiently unpredictable that success in developing specific avian recombinant virus vaccine was uncertain).

**6) The amount of direction provided by the inventor:** The inventor provides very little direction in the instant specification. There are no examples with the R1, R0 or R4 being heterocyclic groups nor are there any examples with them having other substituents or any chemical moiety selected from alkyl, 3 to 8 membered partially or fully saturated carbocyclic ring or 3-6 membered partially of fully saturated heterocycle, aryl, heteroaryl, wherein the chemical moiety is again optionally substituted. and also there is no data provided to show that these compounds do indeed treat obesity.

**7) The existence of working examples:** The instant specification does not have any working examples commensurate to the scope of the claims. Even the starting materials needed to make these compounds commensurate with the scope, are not provided.

**8) The quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure:** Since there are no working examples, and the direction given is so little, it would require an undue amount of experimentation to make and use the compounds of the invention.

Taking the above eight factors into consideration, it is not seen where the instant specification enables the ordinary artisan to make and/or use the instantly claimed invention.

Genetech Inc Vs Nova Nordisk 42 USPQ 2d 1001.

“A patent is not a hunting license. It is not a reward for search but compensation for its successful conclusion and patent protection is granted in return for an enabling disclosure of an invention, not for vague intimations of general ideas that may or may not be workable.”

MPEP 2164.01(a) states, "A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557,1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)." That conclusion is clearly justified here. Thus, undue experimentation will be required to practice Applicants' invention.

### ***Conclusion***

Claims 1-4, 7-11, 30, 31, 34-36, 42, 43, 49, 55, 59 and 64 are not found to be allowable.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rita J. Desai whose telephone number is 571-272-0684. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, flex time..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Janet Andres can be reached on 571-272-0867. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1625

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Rita J. Desai  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1625

*R. Desai*  
7/24/07

R.D.  
July 24, 2007